

Business of the House

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now I want to know from Sri G. V. Gowda about the point raised by him yesterday with regard to putting the amendment to the vote of the House. Has he looked into it? I will give him all the relevant books to him if he wants.

Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—The Chair was pleased to say that it was done on merits.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does he want me to give a ruling on that point?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—It was done yesterday itself, Sir. The Chair said something.

1.30 P.M.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Sri R. DAYANANDA SAGAR (Deputy Minister for Sericulture).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table of the House, Notification No. CI-22 SAD '63, dated 20th March, 1964 (Further amendment to the Mysore Silk Worm Seed and Cocoon (Regulation of Production, Supply and Distribution) Rules, 1960; as required under sub-section (3) of section 18 of the Mysore Silk Worm Seed and Cocoon (Regulation of Production, Supply and Distribution) Act, 1959.

BANGALORE UNIVERSITY BILL, 1964.

(Clause by clause consideration contd.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—The time fixed for the Bill was over yesterday itself. May I extend it till 3 o' clock today?

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Time is extended till 3 o' clock.

CLAUSE 7

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That clause 7 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 8

Sri S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelagola).— I move:

“That sub-clause (5) shall be deleted and sub-clauses and (7) shall be re-numbered as sub-clauses (5) and (6).”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved

“That Sub-clause (5) shall be deleted and sub-clauses (6) and (7) shall be re-numbered as sub-clauses (5) and (6).”

† Sri S. SIVAPPA.—My amendment is very simple in the sense that sub-clause (5) is unnecessary, because in sub-clause 4 the purpose of inspection by Government will be served, which says:

“The Syndicate shall communicate through the Vice-Chancellor to the Government such action, if any, as it has taken or it proposes to take upon the result of such inspection or inquiry.”

That means the Syndicate will inform the Government of the action they have taken on the report of inspection that the Government has sent to the University. So, sub-clause (5) will be unnecessary.

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—Sir, I am sorry, I am not accepting the amendment. This sub-clause (5) gives power to the Government to make inspection. If the Government sends some body to inspect, the report substituted by him will be sent to the Syndicate first for taking such action as is necessary. In case, the Syndicate does not take action or does not take satisfactory action, the inspection report will have no value if this sub-clause (5) is deleted. That is why this has been put in. If the Syndicate does not take any action, Government must have some power. In every case, it is expected that the Syndicate will comply and take necessary action.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—This means that you will be giving abundant power to the Government. It is almost commanding the Syndicate. That means taking away of autonomy.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That Sub-clause (5) shall be deleted and sub-clauses (6) and (7) shall be re-numbered as sub-clauses (5) and (6).”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That clause 8 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 8 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSe 9

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, I move

“That in clause 9 items (d), (e) and (f) shall be re-lettered as items (e), (f) and (g) respectively and after item (c) the following item shall be inserted, viz.—

“(d) The Controller of examinations.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That in clause 9 items (d), (e) and (f) shall be re-lettered as items (e), (f) and (g) respectively and after item (c) the following item shall be inserted, viz.—

“(d) The Controller of Examinations.”

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—The Controller is a very important officer of the University.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, I oppose the amendment. Item (f) says :

“such other persons in the service of the University as may be declared by the Statutes to be the officers of the University.”

Under a Statute the Controller of Examinations could come in. There is no reason why it should be inserted in the Act itself. My friend's intention could be covered by item (f).

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I accept the amendment. It is also enumerated in section 6 of the Mysore University Act. So, there is no harm in accepting it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That in clause 9 items (d), (e) and (f) shall be re-lettered as items (e), (f) and (g) respectively and after item (c) the following item shall be inserted, viz.—

“(d) The Controller of Examinations.”

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The other amendments become redundant. question is :

“That clause 9, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 9 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 10

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, I move :

“That in sub-clause (1) for the words “The Governor of Mysore” the words “The Chief Justice of the High Court of Judicature of Mysore” shall be substituted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That in sub-clause (1) for the words “The Governor of Mysore” the words “The Chief Justice of the High Court of Judicature of Mysore,” shall be substituted.”

† Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The purpose of my amendment is this: In the Delhi University, from which we are copying the provisions the Chancellor is a person, elected by the Court and that Chancellor presides over the meetings of the Senate and other authorities of the University. Here, we have only the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor and so on. We have also made a provision that the Chancellor shall be the Head of the University and he presides over the meetings of the Senate, whenever he is present. Government have copied almost all the powers of the Chancellor which have been enumerated in the Delhi University Act. There the Chancellor is an elected person, but here the Chancellor is not an elected man. In making the Governor Chancellor, you are only copying the other University Acts. If the Governor is there as Chancellor, he cannot come and preside over the Senate meetings. You cannot equate this with the Universities of Mysore and Karnataka, where the Chancellor does not preside over the meetings. The Governor is already the Chancellor for both the Universities in the Mysore State. By making the Chief Justice of the High Court of Mysore as the Chancellor, you will be only relieving the Governor from becoming the Chancellor of the third University in the Mysore State. There are other Universities where the Chief Justice is the Chancellor. For example, the Chancellor of the neighbouring University, viz, Sri Venkateswara University is the Chief Justice of Andhra Pradesh. So I request the Minister for Education to accept this simple amendment and make the Chief Justice of Mysore the Chancellor of the Federal University of Bangalore. The seat of the Chief Justice is in Bangalore; so he can be very easily accommodated. The amendment can be accepted and the Minister would find no difficulty in accepting it.

† Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I am sorry I cannot accept it. Everywhere, except in one or two places, the Governor of the State is the Chancellor. In Maharashtra they have got six Universities and everywhere the Governor of Maharashtra is the Chancellor and they are going to have the seventh one also. So there is no difficulty so far as the appointment of the Governor as Chancellor is concerned. After all, the post of the Governor is the highest post and he should naturally occupy the office of high academic distinction.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the amendment to the vote of the House. The question is :

“That in sub-clause (1) for the words ‘The Governor of Mysore’ the words ‘The Chief Justice of the High Court of the Judicature of Mysore’ shall be substituted.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment No. 14.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Sir, I move :

“That in sub-clause (1) for the word ‘Mysore’ the words ‘The State of Mysore’ shall be substituted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That in sub-clause (1) for the word ‘Mysore’ the words ‘The State of Mysore’ shall be substituted.”

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I am accepting it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That in sub-clause (1) for the word ‘Mysore’ the words ‘The State of Mysore’ shall be substituted.”

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That clause 10, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 10, as amended was added to the Bill:

CLAUSE 11.

Mr. SPEAKER.—all the Amendments to this clause may be taken together.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR (Belgaum City).—I am not moving my amendment.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Sir, I move :

“That in sub-clause (2) for the word ‘selected’ the word ‘recommended’ shall be substituted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That in sub-clause (2) for the word ‘selected’ the word ‘recommended’ shall be substituted.”

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, I beg to move :

“That for sub-clauses (2) the following shall be substituted :

“(2) The Vice-Chancellor shall be appointed by the Chancellor upon the recommendation of the Syndicate, provided that if the Chancellor does not approve the person so recommended, he may call for fresh recommendation from the Syndicate.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That for sub-clauses (2) the following shall be substituted :

“(2) The Vice-Chancellor shall be appointed by the Chancellor upon the recommendation of the Syndicate, provided that if the Chancellor does not approve the person so recommended, he may call for fresh recommendation from the Syndicate.”

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, I move :

“That for sub-clauses (2) and (3) the following shall be substituted :

“(2) The Vice-Chancellor shall be appointed by the Chancellor from among three persons, recommended by the Senate.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That for sub-clauses (2) and (3) the following shall be substituted :

“(2) The Vice-Chancellor shall be appointed by the Chancellor from among three persons, recommended by the Senate.”

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, I move :

“That for sub-clauses (2) and (3) the following shall be substituted and other sub-clauses shall be renumbered suitably.

“(2) the Vice-Chancellor shall be elected by the Senate from out of a panel of not less than three persons selected by the Syndicate.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That for sub-clauses (2) and (3) the following shall be substituted and other sub-clauses shall be renumbered suitably.

“(2) the Vice-Chancellor shall be elected by the Senate from out of a panel of not less than three persons selected by the Syndicate.”

All the Amendments are before the House.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—My amendment is a very simple amendment. Here it is worded that the Vice-Chancellor is to be selected from the list, but the recommendation made by the Committee is not selection; they only make a recommendation. Just to explain the meaning of the provision correctly, instead of ‘selected’, the word ‘recommended’ is introduced.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The appointment of the Vice-Chancellor has been a matter of controversy. During the debate in the last two days, divergent views were expressed by Honourable Members as to how the Vice-Chancellor should be appointed. In the appointment of a Vice-Chancellor, great caution will have to be taken because we see in the working of the Universities there is special politics called University Politics and that politics is not played by politicians but that politics is played by the University men, particularly the representatives of various institutions forming the University. So while deciding as to how a Vice-Chancellor shall be appointed, great caution has to be taken. The appointment or election or selection of a Vice-Chancellor becomes at times

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

a matter of intrigue for power. So in order to avoid such intrigues, a suitable method of appointing the Vice-Chancellor will have to be chosen. A Vice-Chancellor should be selected in such a manner as would avoid all such intrigues and safeguard the interests of the University. Here the method that is suggested is that a Committee of three is to be appointed and one member of that Committee is to be nominated by the Chancellor and 2 members are to be appointed by the Syndicate. I do not understand, when the final approval lies with the Chancellor, why a nominee of the Chancellor should be on that Committee. That will result in having a Vice-Chancellor of the choice of the Chancellor. I want to avoid such a situation. The Vice-Chancellor is the Chief Executive Officer of the University and he should be a man who gains the respect and the confidence of the University, particularly the syndicate which is the executive body of the University. The choice of the Vice-Chancellor should be left entirely to the University. The Chancellor should have no hand in it. The Chancellor may approve the appointment or may refer back any recommendation sent by the Syndicate. The Radhakrishnan Committee's report discussed this matter and my amendment incorporates the procedure suggested by them. The Committee say: "The Vice-Chancellor, for whose appointment the University is responsible, will, as of duty strive to gain the respect and confidence of his colleagues and secondly it is part of the University's duty to learn how to choose its own Vice-Chancellor, wisely and that therefore to deprive it of this duty, would be a counsel of despair. But we recommend that certain safeguards in the method of choosing the Vice-Chancellor should be laid down by each University and the method we have suggested is that the Chancellor should appoint the Vice-Chancellor upon the recommendation of the Syndicate". According to this method, the Vice-Chancellor will be a man who gains the full confidence of the syndicate and secondly the University should have independence in the selection of the Vice-Chancellor. The University should have its own independence and it will be better in all respects if the Vice-Chancellor is recommended by the Syndicate. For these reasons, I have moved this amendment.

† Sri G. V. GOWDA.—While replying to the debate, the Hon'ble Education Minister has been pleased to observe that the proposed University will be federal in type, national in character, broader in outlook and democratic in approach. But when we see the procedure adopted for appointing the Vice-Chancellor, none of these noble sentiments are reflected. Simply because such a procedure prevails in the Delhi University, it cannot mean that it is so sound that we must adopt it as of compulsion, even though it is undemocratic. Under the clause in the Bill, the Chancellor not only makes the appointment but he would also have a hand in getting his own man appointed. It is the Chancellor who appoints one Member to that Committee and it is he who nominates the Chairman of the committee. Naturally the person who is appointed

by the Chancellor as a Member of the Committee is likely to be appointed a Chairman also. That Chairman is also likely to recommend atleast one name. There is a possibility that 3 names might be suggested to the Chancellor and out of it, it is likely that the person recommended by the Chairman would be accepted by the Chancellor as his choice for the Vice-Chancellor. Such a possibility could not be ruled out. When we want to create a democratic set-up, it is desirable that the senate, which is the supreme governing body, should have a say in the matter. In Madras, the Chancellor has got to appoint one of the persons recommended by the Senate. I submit that the procedure suggested in the Bill involves complications. It says that the person recommended should not be connected with University affairs. It is likely that a person not having any experience in matters of education, is appointed a member of this committee which suggests the panel of names for Vice-Chancellorship. How can we be sure that only a suitable person would be chosen for this committee? I am submitting that there is a possibility of serious suspicion in the matter. Why should we adopt a procedure whereby a committee is appointed and that committee suggests names and the Chancellor accepts one of them. Why should we not be direct and frank in these matters? We want a good Vice-Chancellor. The syndicate or the senate must have a say in the matter. According to the procedure in clause 11, both will have no voice. The syndicate can only nominate 2 persons to the committee which would give a panel of names. If the procedure prevailing in Madras is not to be adopted as suggested by me, I would be glad if the Minister accepts the amendments of Sri Sunthankar or even that of Sri Sivappa. The Vice-Chancellor would be purely responsible to the syndicate and senate if Sri Sivappa's amendment is accepted. I hope the Education Minister wants the University to function well and that it should have the right type of person as its executive head.

These members may do more harm than good for they do not know any affairs of the University. Therefore, let the Hon'ble Minister be magnanimous to accept any of these amendments.

2.00 P.M.

† Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, my amendment reads like this:

"the Vice-Chancellor shall be elected by the Senate from out of a panel of not less than three persons selected by the Syndicate."

The post of the Vice-Chancellor in the University is the most important one. The Vice-Chancellor, whoever that may be, must command the confidence of the authorities of the University. The sovereign body, that is the Senate is the Supreme Body of the University and the constitution of the Senate consists of very learned people of the Bangalore University area. It is constituted in such a way that it includes all the intelligentsia in the University area. So, in all respects the Senate represents the true opinion of the University area.

(SRI S. SIVAPPA)

Now, as has been provided in the Bill, the Vice-Chancellor is nominated by the Chancellor. The Chancellor as we have already accepted, is the Governor of the State. That means, the Government wants to have a person of their own choice and put him as the Vice-Chancellor over the administration of the University. Thereby the Government wants to rule the University through back door by appointing the Vice-Chancellor of their own choice. During the general discussion yesterday, we have seen some members expressing their views as to how the Government have handled the two Universities of this State and how they are interfering with the administration of the Mysore University. Of course, they cannot do so in respect of the Karnataka University where the Vice-Chancellor is an elected man. An elected Vice-Chancellor has been there for the last twelve years and he commands the confidence of the Senate and of the Syndicate. Here, the Government can bring in any person they like, whether he is an educationalist or whether he is a politician and impose him on the University and take away the autonomy. That autonomy becomes useless. We have seen how political interference has affected the administration of the University in our State. To avoid all this, it is very necessary that the Vice-Chancellor should be an elected man, elected not by all the people but by the sovereign body of the University—the Senate. By this, we can achieve the laudable ideas we have in mind. In the Delhi University the Chancellor is elected and the Government is copying the Delhi University Act. Here, at least why not have the Vice-Chancellor elected? Yesterday, suspicions were expressed by some Members that Government might have had certain persons in mind to put them as the Vice-Chancellor and that was why this power was sought under the Bill. To remove this fear that was expressed by several members and also to make it more democratic, I only request the Education Minister to accept this amendment and make the Bangalore University a truly autonomous and democratic institution.

† SRI GANJI VEERAPPA.—So far as this is concerned, I can tell Sri Sivappa that much can be said in respect of all methods. So far, there is no method which is found to be all satisfactory. In fact, much can be said against the method of direct election of the Vice-Chancellor from the Senate. In fact, argument may be advanced that he will be a controversial figure in the Syndicate. Even against that method of direct election much argument can be advanced that it is not satisfactory. So, also the question of nomination is not desirable. There cannot be two opinions on that. In fact, what is attempted to be made by this Committee or by the Government through this Bill is to find a sort of uniformity. We cannot say that it is all satisfactory. Anyway that is the system that is working satisfactorily in the Delhi University. It is not an experiment that we have made. I think, there is no harm in taking up this and trying here so that if this is not satisfactory this House is at liberty to bring in an amendment. With

the experience so far gained elsewhere, there are various systems that are working. The Committee that was appointed by the Government have recommended this and Government, of course, have accepted the recommendations of the Committee and adopted the same in this Bill. I think that this is a good suggestion and it can be accepted and tried; so that if we are not satisfied we can make any changes later on.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ನಿರಾ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆಯ ಮೂಲಕ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಎಂದು ತಂದಿರುವ ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಬೆಂಬಲ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಿನ್ನೆ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಾದ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ಹಿಂದೂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದು ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಸಾರಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಮಾದರಿಯಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾದರಿಯಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಬ್ಯಾಕ-ಡೂರ್ ಮೆಥಡ್ ನಿಂದ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳಾಗಿ ತಂದು ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠಾಪನ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯೇ? ಅವರ ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿನಿಂದ ಬರಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಬಹುಮತದಿಂದ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಪ್ರಥಮತಃ ಇವರ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೇ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿದೆ. ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗಾಂಜಿ ವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಪೂರ್ವ-ಪೂರ್ವ ಆಗಿದೆ ಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಯಾವ ಪೂರ್ವ ಇದೆಯೋ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವ ಪೂರ್ವ. ಚಾನ್ಸಲರಿಗೆ 3 ಜನ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದು, ಚಾನ್ಸಲರು ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರನ್ನು ಚುನಾಯಿಸುವುದು. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಮೂರು ಜನ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನುಳ್ಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Did the member not say all these things while speaking on the Bill?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—This is one of its first kind of University that is going to be established in South India. During the course of the debate, I expressed something else other than this.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let me know the time the member would require so that I can fix the time limit.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—How can I say, Sir? If the Chair does not allow me to speak, I will resume my seat because the Chair is the supreme authority.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Do I ask for any information? If he does not answer that, he is at liberty to do it. I know how to fix the time limit.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—It all depends upon the circumstances and the way in which the argument is advanced. I may take two minutes or I may take 10 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Hon'ble Member does not know how much time he intends to take, I shall not allow him.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, I am not a 'yogi'. If I had been a 'yogi' I would not have come here, and I would have gone to the Nandi Hills.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member may kindly answer my question.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—When I begin to speak and offer my remarks.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Am I to ask the member after his speech is over? I must ask before a member begins, and not after his speech is closed.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I want about 10 to 15 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot give 15 minutes. I can only give him 10 minutes.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—All right, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The satisfaction expressed by the member in that fashion will be wrong.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What is the word that has to be used?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Do I want the member's approbation for the decision I have taken? Let him kindly continue quietly.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—All right, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He should discontinue that habit.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, when you were an Advocate, every time you used to address 'Your Lord', 'Your Lord.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is a wrong practice which deserves to be discontinued hereafter.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—All right.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would call upon the Member to apologize.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Yes, Sir. I apologize.

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾವು ಇಷ್ಟಲ್ಲಾ ತರಪೇತನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಾದಮೇಲೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಏನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು 10 ನಿಮಿಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಮುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ಇಂಡಿಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಸಾರಿ ಬಹಳ ಅತ್ಯುತ್ತಮವಾದಂಥ ರೂಪು ರೇಖೆಗಳನ್ನುಳ್ಳ ಈ ಒಂದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳನ್ನಾರಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಿದರೂ ಬರೀ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ವಾಸನೆ, ಯಾವ ದಿಕ್ಕಿನಿಂದ ನೋಡಿದರೂ ಬರೀ ಜಾತೀಯ ವಾಸನೆ. ಕೀಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ವಾಸನೆಗಳೇ, ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಅವು ಸೂಜಿಗಲ್ಲಿನಂತೆ ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅಂಟಿಕೊಂಡಿವೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ನೇಮಕವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಾಹಣೆ ಮಾಡಬಲ್ಲರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ ಜನ ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅದರ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಬಲ್ಲರೂ ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇವರ ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ತಿರುಳಿದೆ, ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಜನ ಮರಾಢಿ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಜನ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಆಜಿಚೇಷಣೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರು ತುಂಬಾ ಸರ್ವಾಧಿಕಾರದಿಂದ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನೇ ಇರಲಿ ನಾವು ಇರುವವರೆಗೂ ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇ ಸರಿಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಇವರ ಈ ಒಂದು ಮೊಂಡು ವಾದ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದು ಗೌರವಾನ್ವಿತವಾದುದಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಇವರು ಮನಗಾಣಬೇಕು. ಮೂವರು ಜನರಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದ ಸಮಿತಿಯು ಹೆಸರುಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಚಾನ್ಸಲರಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅವರು ಅವರೊಳಗೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಚುನಾಯಿಸಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನವಿಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಆ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸುವಾಗಲೂ ತಮಗೆ ಬಂದ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಸಮಾಧಾನವಾಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇಂತಿಂಥ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ಕಳುಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಯೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಅಸೈನ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡದೆ ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಆ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿನ ಹೆಸರುಗಳು ನಮಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹಿಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನಿಲುವೇನು? ಮೂರು ಜನರೂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು? ಮೂರು ಜನರನ್ನು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಹ ಕಮಿಷನರಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಛಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ದೈರೆಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕಿತ್ತಲ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಒಬ್ಬ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದರೆ, ಇದು ನನಗಾದರೂ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ, ಇದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಕುಠಾರ ಪ್ರಾಯವಾದದ್ದು, ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಗದಾಪ್ರಹಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ

ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ದೇಶವಾಗಲೀ ಇಂಥಾ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಶಾಸನಕಡತಕ್ಕೆ ಏರಿಸಿ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ಪುಸ್ತಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆಯುವುದಾದರೆ ಇದು ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ದುರ್ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ, ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 12 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಅತ್ಯುತ್ತಮವಾದ ಸ್ನಾನಮಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗೆ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? ನುರಿತರತಕ್ಕ ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗಾಂಜಿ ವಿರಪ್ಪನವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಅವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ? ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯು ಯಾರದೋ ಒಬ್ಬರ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನಾ ಗುಂಪನ್ನು ರೆಪ್ರೆಜೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ನೆಟ್ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥಾ ಪಾಲಿಟಿಕ್ಸ್ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ, ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾಲಿಟಿಕ್ಸ್ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಏತಕ್ಕಿಂದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಗುಂಪಿನವರು ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬ್ರಾಹ್ಮಣರು, ಒಕ್ಕಲಿಗರು ಬೇರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಜನಾಂಗದವರೂ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ, ರಾಜಕೀಯಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗಾಂಜಿ ವಿರಪ್ಪನವರು ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಒಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭಾತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ನಡೆದಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಈ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭಾತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನವರನ್ನು ತುಳಿದಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ನಡೆದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಜನ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇನ್ನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ನಿನ್ನ ನಡೆಂದಂಥಾದ್ದು ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇವೊತ್ತು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದು ಎರಡನೆಯ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ. ಇವರು ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಷದ ಬೀಜವನ್ನು ಬಿತ್ತುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಸರಿಯೇ? ನೀವು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿ ಎಂದು ನೀವು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let not the Hon'ble Member impute motives to others.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—It is only a general observation that I am making. I am not making any remarks against any individual.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the Hon'ble Member entitled to attribute motives to the whole class?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I am only expressing the feelings of the people who have elected me.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member has no right to attribute motives to the members generally.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I am not saying anything against my friend Sri Ganji Veerappa.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member said that he was talking with mental reservations, having something in his mind.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—It is my contention that my friend did not come out in his true colours.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member has no business to say that any member did not come in true colours. It may be his opinion. He is entitled to have it, but let him keep it within himself. Let him not make any remark against any particular member that he is not coming in his true colours, that he is hiding something and all that.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I have said that something is working in his mind, but he is not coming out with that.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I have come out with what I feel.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ಇವರು ಈತಿದ್ದು ಪಡೆಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಇಕ್ಕಟ್ಟು ಬರಬಹುದು, ಇವರಿಗೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರಿಗೆ ಸ್ಥಾನ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇದು ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಪಾದ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗಾಂಜಿ ವಿರಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In the absence of the member, how does he say it? Let not the Hon'ble Member develop the point?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I request my friend that if he wants, he may try to become an Education Minister or Speaker or something else, but not for the office of Vice-Chancellor, because he is not suited for it. That is my intention. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗಾಂಜಿ ವಿರಪ್ಪನವರು ಮೈಸೂರು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೆನೆಟ್‌ಗೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗೆ ನಿಂತಾಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತು. ಇವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥ ಪೋಟಿವಲ್ ಗೆದ್ದು ಒಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ ಇದೆ. ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲೇ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗೆ ನಿಂತರೆ ಆಗ ಅವರ ಗುಣಗಳು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ ಆಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಲರನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಆಗ ಯಾರು ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಎಂದು ಇವರಿಗೆ ಭಯ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಏನು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಇದು ಒಂದು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ; ಈ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಗುಂಪಿನ ಜನ ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಜನ ಅಂದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಹೇಳಿದಂತಹ ಮಾತುಗಳು ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ರೆಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಆಗಿವೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ನಾನು ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಓದುತ್ತೇನೆ. “ನಮ್ಮ ವಿದ್ಯಾಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕೊನೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಂಬ ವಿಷದ ಬೀಜವನ್ನು ಬಿತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ” ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಎಮೋಷನಲ್ ಇಂಟೆಲಿಜೆನ್ಸ್ ಅನ್ನು ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನೇಕರು ಹೇಳಿ ಮೈಸೂರು, ಕೊನೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರು ಎನ್ನುವ ಭಾವನೆ ಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಕೊನೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷದ ಬೀಜವನ್ನು ಯಾರು ಬಿತ್ತಿದ್ದು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ ಇವರು ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಷದ ಬೀಜವನ್ನು ಬಿತ್ತುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ಅಸ್ತವ್ಯಸ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯ ಅಸ್ತಿತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಇದರ ಜಾತಕಫಲವನ್ನು ಬರೆಯುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಏನಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಸರ್ವ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿದೆ. ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಕಂಡೋಲೆನ್ಸ್ ರೆಸಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಅನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದರೆಂದರೆ ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ರಾಜಕೀಯಗಳಿವೆ ಅಂಥವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಸರಿ ಯಾದಂತಹ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕು. ದಿವಂಗತ ಪಂಡಿತ ಜವಾಹರ್‌ಲಾಲ್ ನೆಹರೂ ಅವರು ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡವರು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The last two sentences of the speech may be expunged.

2-30 P. M.

†Sri S. R. KANTHI.—So far as amendment Numbers 16, 17 and 18 are concerned, I am extremely sorry I am not in a position to accept them. So far as amendment Number 15 is concerned, I accept it because, it is in consonance with the whole tenor of clause 11.

The amendment moved by Sri Sunthankar is that the syndicate should recommend and that the Chancellor shall appoint. The amendment of Sri Venkatai Gowda is that the recommendation should come from the senate instead of the syndicate and the Chancellor shall

appoint that person. Sri Sivappa's amendment is to the effect that there should be an election to the Vice-Chancellorship by the Senate. All this shows that there are different methods of appointing the Vice-Chancellor. All these methods have been tried one way or the other. The method suggested in the Bill is that of the Delhi University. In the morning I heard from one of the highest authorities that the same would be the procedure or the method to be adopted in the Udaipur University. It has been of late the model for all to copy. No procedure or method is foolproof. There are bound to be difficulties in every procedure. Even in the method followed by the Karnatak University I know there were certain difficulties before Dr. Pavate came on the scene. He has been a very powerful personality and that is the reason why the Karnatak University method has worked. Hon'ble Members might also remember what I said sometime back that I may try to have a common method for the election of the Vice-Chancellor for the two Universities. I have had discussions with the Vice-Chancellors in the small sub-committee appointed in this behalf but I have not succeeded. We are still in the stage of negotiations and understanding each other. I can only recommend that the provision in the Bill is best.

The motives imputed against the Government are not fair. The method of appointing the Vice-Chancellor by the Chancellor comes into operation 3 years after the establishment of the University. The first Vice-Chancellor will be appointed by the Government on a tentative basis for a period of 3 years. That being so, all the charges made that the Government is trying to manoeuvre things is not fair. At any rate this Government will not be in office when the first Vice-Chancellor will be appointed according to the procedure in clause 11. I do not want Hon. Members to be under any misapprehension about this. I can only say that it is difficult for the Government to get a Vice-Chancellor. It is not so easy and we have been trying our level best to get the best man. If any member is under the impression that we have made up our mind so far as the Vice-Chancellor is concerned, I can only say that he can wipe out his impression. We are still trying to find out the Vice-Chancellor for the University.

One Hon. Member made the remark that the Karnatak University Senate was packed up with members of one community. The Hon. Member does not care to look into the position. The Senate of Karnatak University consists of not less than 120 persons and the community to which he refers is not even one-third of the entire Senate. If the Hon. Member wants to verify, he can just get the list and he will find out that his impression is incorrect. This University of Bangalore is not going to be the sole monopoly of any community. After all in Bangalore City we have people coming from every community and everyone will behave as independently as he can. That is why levelling of charges against the Government that it is trying to manoeuvre things is not correct. If the Hon. Member still persists in saying that sort of a thing, I can only say that nobody except himself is to be blamed. That is a

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

wrong impression. I am sorry I cannot accept amendments Number 16, 17 and 18. But I would accept Amendment Number 15.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I seek a clarification. The Hon. Minister was pleased to say that it was difficult for the Government to select a Vice-Chancellor. Then why not leave the matter to the Senate in their collective wisdom to choose the best man? The Minister has come out with the truth when he said that it was not easy to select the Vice-Chancellor. If that be so, why should the Chancellor take the responsibility?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The Hon. Member has misunderstood the tenor of my reply. When I said that it was not easy for the Government to get a Vice-Chancellor, I was not referring to clause 11 but to the subsequent clause where a temporary Vice-Chancellor has to be appointed by Government. This matter does not come under the procedure under clause 11.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That for sub-clause (2) the following shall be substituted:

“(2) The Vice-Chancellor shall be appointed by the Chancellor upon the recommendation of the Syndicate. Provided that if the Chancellor does not approve the person so recommended, he may call for fresh recommendation from the syndicate.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:—

“That for sub-clauses (2) and (3) the following shall be substituted:

“(2), the Vice-Chancellor, shall be appointed by the Chancellor from among three persons, recommended by the Senate.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That for sub-clauses (2) and (3) the following shall be substituted and other sub-clauses shall be renumbered suitably.”

“(2) the Vice-Chancellor shall be elected by the Senate from out of a panel of not less than three persons selected by the Syndicate.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That in sub-clause (2) for the word “selected” the word “recommended” shall be substituted.”

The amendment was adopted.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I beg to move :

“That for sub-clause (4) the following proviso shall be added :—

“provided that he shall not hold office for more than three terms.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That for sub-clause (4) the following proviso shall be added :

“provided that he shall not hold office for more than three terms.”

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, according to this sub-clause the Vice-Chancellor shall hold office for a term of three years. He can be re-appointed also. If a Vice-Chancellor is re-appointed again and again for a number of times, then it becomes a monopoly of one person. I do not want this to happen. The Bangalore University Committee has recommended that he could be there for three terms and not more than three terms, i.e., nine years. The Radhakrishnan Committee Report has recommended that it should be six years and he should not be allowed for re-election. So, there should be some time-limit. My amendment seeks to make it nine years following the recommendation of the Bangalore University Committee report. I request the Minister to accept the amendment.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, this question was considered at the Government level and we found that it was not possible to accept the amendment. The reason is that, a competent Vice-Chancellor can be repeatedly appointed. In the case of Sri Lakshmanaswamy Mudaliar, he has been elected for many times.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—It is a selection.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—It is a matter of opinion. Even in the Karnataka University and Mysore University, they are eligible for any length of time provided their appointment at a time is for three years. Therefore, I am not in a position to accept the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That for sub-clause (4) of clause 11 the following shall be added :—

“provided that he shall not hold office for more than three terms.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment of—Sri G. V. Gowda.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, I move :

“That for sub-clause (5) the following shall be substituted:—

“when any temporary vacancy occurs in the office of the Vice-Chancellor by reason of leave, illness, or other causes, the

(SRI G. V. GOWDA)

Syndicate shall as soon as possible, subject to the approval of the Chancellor make such arrangements for carrying on the duties of the Vice-Chancellor as it may think fit. Until such arrangements are made, the Dean nominated by the Chancellor for that purpose shall carry on the current duties of the office of the Vice-Chancellor."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That for sub-clause (5) the following shall be substituted :—
"when any temporary vacancy occurs in the office of the Vice-Chancellor by reason of leave, illness or other causes, the Syndicate shall as soon as possible, subject to the approval of the Chancellor make such arrangements for carrying on the duties of the Vice-Chancellor as it may think fit. Until such arrangements are made, the Dean nominated by the Chancellor for that purpose shall carry on the current duties of the Office of the Vice-Chancellor."

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, sub-clause (5) of clause 11 says that when any temporary vacancy occurs of the office of the Vice-Chancellor, the Chancellor shall make arrangement to carry on that administration. I propose that that right should be given to the Syndicate. I have drafted this amendment by copying from the Karnatak University enactment. So, the Hon'ble Minister can safely accept this.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, we have followed the Mysore University Act in this regard and I cannot accept it because it is not in consonance with the Mysore University Act.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That for sub-clause (5) the following shall be substituted :
"When any temporary vacancy occurs in the office of the Vice-Chancellor by reason of leave, illness, or other causes, the Syndicate shall as soon as possible, subject to the approval of the Chancellor make such arrangements for carrying on the duties of the Vice Chancellor as it may think fit. Until such arrangements are made, the Dean nominated by the Chancellor for that purpose shall carry on the current duties of the Office of the Vice-Chancellor."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clause 11, as amended stand part of the Bill."

The amendment was adopted.

Clause 11, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to know the sense of the House as to the extension of time. Shall we extend it till that evening?

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The time allotted for this Bill is extended till the evening.

CLAUSE 12.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I beg to move:

“That in sub-clause (5) for the first and second provisos, the following shall be substituted:—

“(2) When action taken by the Vice-Chancellor under this sub-section affects any person in the services of the University, such person shall be entitled to prefer an appeal to the Syndicate within thirty days from the date on which he has notice of such action.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That in sub-clause (5) for the first and second provisos, the following shall be substituted:—

“(2) When action taken by the Vice-Chancellor under this sub-section affects any person in the services of the University, such person shall be entitled to prefer an appeal to the Syndicate within thirty days from the date on which he has notice of such action.”

† Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, this is an act done by the Vice-Chancellor in any case of emergency. Otherwise, in the normal course, the Syndicate would have dealt with that act. When the Vice-Chancellor stands in the shoes of the Syndicate in emergency, that has got to be ratified by the Syndicate. If the Syndicate does not agree with the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor, what is to happen? Here it is said that if the Vice-Chancellor has got to prefer an appeal, he may refer the matter to the Chancellor. The proviso says:

“Provided that if the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor is not approved by the authority concerned, he may refer the matter to the Chancellor whose decision shall be final:

The question of Chancellor giving any decision does not arise at all. In the normal course, the other body, i.e., the Syndicate or the University authorities would have dealt with the matter. There is no point in saying that the Vice-Chancellor has to refer the matter to the Chancellor. The *status quo* should be maintained.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I am sorry, I cannot accept the amendment. I will read for the benefit of the Hon'ble Member the Mysore University Act:

“An appeal shall lie to the Chancellor against any action taken by the Vice-Chancellor.”

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

In the Mysore Act, It is like that. Such appeals shall be filed within 30 days from the date on which the notice of the action is issued. So, I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (5) for the first and second provisos, the following shall be substituted :—

“(-) When action taken by the Vice-Chancellor under this sub-section affects any person in the services of the University, such person shall be entitled to prefer an appeal to the Syndicate within thirty days from the date on which he has notice of such action.”

The amendment was negatived.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, I beg to move :

“ That after sub-clause (5) the following sub-clause shall be added :—

“(6) The Vice-Chancellor shall give effect to the orders of the Syndicate regarding the appointment, dismissal and suspension of the teachers of the University and its servants and shall exercise general control over the affairs of the University.

“ That sub-clause (6) shall be re-numbered as sub-clause (7).”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendments moved :

“ That after sub-clause (5) the following sub-clause shall be added :—

“(6) The Vice-Chancellor shall give effect to the orders of the Syndicate regarding the appointment, dismissal and suspension of the teachers of the University and its servants and shall exercise general control over the affairs of the University.”

“ That sub-clause (6) shall be re-numbered as sub-clause (7).”

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—In one of the provisions here under clause 11, there is nothing to show that the Vice-Chancellor has got to implement the decisions or orders of the Syndicate. I have copied this from the Madras Act. So, there is no harm in accepting this amendment. It is virtually safe that the Vice-Chancellor is required to implement the decisions of the Syndicate. There is nothing to show what is to happen to the orders of the Syndicate.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—These matters will be covered by the statutes. We cannot have these minor details in the Act. After all the Syndicate is an Executive body of which the Vice-Chancellor is an important member. After all, he is bound to carry out the wishes of the Syndicate. These have to be provided for in the Statute.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :—

“That after sub-clause (5) the following sub-clause shall be added :—

“(6) The Vice-Chancellor shall give effect to the orders of the Syndicate regarding the appointment, dismissal and suspension of the teachers of the University and its servants and shall exercise general control over the affairs of the University.”

“That sub-clause (6) shall be re-numbered as sub-clause (7).”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :—

“That Clause 12 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 12 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the House will rise and meet again half-an-hour later.

The House adjourned for recess at Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty-five Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

CLAUSE 13.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Sir, I move :

“That in sub-clause (8) item (d) shall be omitted and item (e) shall be re-lettered as item (d).”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That in Clause 13, in sub-clause (8) item (d) shall be omitted and item (e) shall be re-lettered as item (d).”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Next Amendment.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I move :

“That after Clause 13 the following Clause shall be inserted, viz.—

“13-A The Controller of Examinations.—

“(1) The Controller of Examinations shall be a whole-time salaried officer of the University appointed by the Syndicate in accordance with such terms and conditions as are prescribed by the Statutes.”

(SRI GANJI VEERAPPA)

“(2) He shall be in charge of the conduct of examinations of the University and matters relating thereto and shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Statutes or Ordinances or as required by the Vice-Chancellor.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That after Clause 13 the following Clause shall be inserted,
viz.—

“(13)—A The Controller of Examinations.—

“(1) The Controller of Examinations shall be a whole-time salaried officer of the University appointed by the Syndicate in accordance with such terms and conditions as are prescribed by the Statutes.

“(2) He shall be in charge of the conduct of examinations of the University and matters relating thereto and shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Statutes or Ordinances or as required by the Vice-Chancellor.”

† Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—We have accepted when we took up clause 9 that the Controller of Examinations should be one of the officers of the University as the Registrar and Bursar. Then we have to define the functions of the Controller. The functions of the Controller of Examinations are defined like this by moving this amendment. Because, the Bill is silent with regard to the functions of the Controller of Examinations. In fact, this is practically copied from the Mysore University Act. So I do not think there is any controversy with regard to the functions of the Controller of Examinations. So Clause-13-A is necessary as a consequence of this, and amendment to clause 13 is also necessary because we have to re-number it. So amendment No. 25 is the consequence of amendment No. 26. So I think they may be accepted by the House.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I accept the amendments. I only request the Chair that amendment No. 26 may be put first.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That after Clause 13, the following Clause shall be inserted,
viz.

“13-A. The Controller of Examinations.—

“The Controller of Examinations shall be a whole time salaried officer of the University appointed by the Syndicate in accordance with such terms and conditions as are prescribed by the Statutes.

“(2) He shall be in charge of the conduct of examinations of the University and matters relating thereto and shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Statutes or Ordinances or as required by the Vice-Chancellor.”

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That in clause 13 in sub-clause (8) item (d) shall be omitted and item (e) shall be re-lettered as item (d).”

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put clause 13 as amended: The question is :

“That clause 13, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 13, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 14. There is no amendment. The question is :

“That clause 14 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 14 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 15

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are two amendments.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Sir, I move :

“That in sub-clause (1) for the words ‘one year’ the words ‘two years’ shall be substituted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That in sub-clause (1) for the words ‘one year’, the words ‘two years’ shall be substituted.”

† Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—This is a simple amendment. According to the clause, Deans shall rotate once a year. I have suggested that the period might be extended to 2 years. In a subsequent clause, two of the Deans are to be in the Syndicate for a period of 2 years. That being so, I thought it would be inconsistent if the life of a particular Dean was to be only one year. Hence the amendment. I hope the Hon'ble Minister would accept this reasonable amendment.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I accept the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That in sub-clause (1) for the words ‘one year’ the words ‘two years’ shall be substituted.”

The amendment was adopted.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I beg to move :

“That in proviso to sub-clause (1); line 3 for the words ‘such teacher’ the words ‘Seniormost teacher’ shall be substituted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That in the proviso to sub-clause (1), line 3 for the words “such teacher” the words “Seniormost teacher” shall be substituted.”

† Sri G. V. GOWDA.—The appointment of a teacher as Dean would arise only in the absence of a Professor and Reader. When such a contingency arises, the Vice-Chancellor may designate a teacher as Dean. Clause 15 (1) would make it clear that seniority is the criterion in respect of Professors and Readers. In the absence of such Professors or Readers, my amendment says that the Vice-Chancellor shall be obliged to choose the seniormost teacher. That would be in keeping with the spirit of clause.

† Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I am sorry I cannot, the amendment accept the reason being that so far as the Professor is concerned, we must take the seniormost person because Professors are tried persons and their competence cannot be in question. Readers are promoted from the Lecturers and it would not be wrong to appoint the seniormost among them as Dean, if no Professor is available. But when it comes to the question of choosing a Lecturer or a teacher as the head of the faculty, he must be a brilliant and capable man. An element of selection becomes inevitable and seniority alone cannot be the consideration because the post of Dean is a responsible one and to get that post, the Lecturer concerned should deserve it.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Supposing there is a bad Professor or a bad Reader, there is no objection to his becoming Dean because he is senior. Moreover, if a teacher is bad, he would in course of time become a Reader and then a professor and in his own right he can become a Dean, in spite of his having been bad as a teacher. How does the Minister reconcile this inconsistency? Moreover, there is no yardstick to measure merit.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—If a Lecturer should become a Dean all of a sudden, overstepping the posts of Readers and Professors, then he must be a brilliant and capable man. Mere seniority alone cannot count. The seniormost teacher is not debarred.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That in the proviso to sub-clause (1), line 3 for the words “such teacher” the words “Seniormost teacher” shall be substituted.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That clause 15, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I demand a division.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the question again. The question is :

“That clause 15, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I press for a division.

The House divided.

MR. SPEAKER.—The result is that 36 Members are in favour and that 25 Members are against it.

The motion is therefore adopted.

"Clause 15, as amended was added to the Bill"

† SRI G. V. GOWDA.—On a point of order, Sir. When the particular point was debated upon, there were only 20 members on the other side and 22 on this side. These members have heard the arguments for and against the amendment. Now, after the bell was rung many of the members on the other side entered. If they had been here at the time of the debate, I would believe that they might have been convinced and some of them would have voted with us. Now, without understanding what the arguments were, they have come here and voted against my amendment. Is it proper to seek support either this way or that way without knowing what has happened and without knowing the reasons offered by members who sponsored the amendment and the reply? I wish the Hon'ble Chair would consider this matter and give a ruling on this point.

SRI R. S. HEGDE (Honnavar).—I am raising a point or order on the point of order. The Hon'ble Member assumes the powers of the Speaker. This should not be allowed.

SRI V. M. DEO (Gubbi).—Sir, this is a very imperfect Assembly, we all agree. (laughter).

MR. SPEAKER.—Sri Deo may please wait; he need not rush like that. Am I to preside over an imperfect Assembly? I am presiding over a perfect Assembly. (laughter).

Now, I will deal with the point. First, there is no substance in the point of order raised by Sri Hegde, because a point of order may be accepted or rejected, or may be accepted partly. Most of the points of order are raised on assumptions and presumptions; what can I do? Parliamentary procedure permits it.

Coming to the point of Sri G. V. Gowda, he forgets that there is no rule which enables me to say that after the bell is rung and after new entrants have come, they should not be permitted to participate in the voting. The rule distinctly says that bell has to be rung so that members who were not present may come in. So, there is no substance in the point of order raised by Sri G. V. Gowda.

Now, Amendment of Sri Sivappa/Sri S. M. Krishna will go.

CLAUSE 16

SRI S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, I move:

"That after item (G) the following item shall be added.—

"(H) Board of appointments"

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That after item (G) the following item shall be added :—

“(H) Board of appointments”

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, the Board of Appointments is one of the most important authorities in the University. That has been omitted. So, I request the Hon'ble Minister for Education to include this in the list of Authorities of the University.

4-00 P.M.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I believe, Sri Sivappa knows the provision in the Mysore University Act.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let him not believe like that.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—In fact, this Board of Appointment is advisably not included here as an authority because it is not a permanent authority. When the appointments are over, the Board is not in existence. It is not a permanent authority under the University to exist. It comes into being only when the question of appointments is there. I may add.....

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The Board of Appointment is a permanent authority.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—In the Mysore University, both of us know, in fact there is no permanent body as Board of Appointments. Recently, we constituted a Board of Appointment here because some appointments had to be made. The matter went up to the High Court with regard to the provision of the Mysore University Act and some appointments made were also challenged. Since it is not a permanent authority, it is not included here.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I invite his attention to clause 27 which says :

“There shall be Boards of Appointments, for the purpose of making selections for appointment as Professors, Readers and Lecturers in the University Service,....”

That means there shall be Boards of Appointments. Those Boards are the authorities constituted for the selection of Professors, Readers and Lecturers. So, it is an authority which is duly constituted under clause 27. When you have constituted that, that Board of Appointments must find a place.

† Sri S.-R. KANTHI.—The Hon'ble Member has quoted the Mysore University Act. There the idea of having a Board of Appointments in the Mysore University was to have a permanent Board of Appointments. It was found out by experience, even in the Mysore University, that it was not possible to have permanent bodies, because the Board of Appointments may have two outsiders, who may be required to recruit a Professor in Physics and that body will be of no use so far as

Chemistry or Mathematics is concerned. We came to know from the Vice-Chancellor of the Mysore University in 1962 that these permanent bodies could not work. So, we have now made an amendment to the Mysore University Act to the effect that these bodies can be *ad-hoc* bodies. In the present Act, these are *ad-hoc* bodies. If you want to have a Board for every appointment, there will have to be a number of Boards. It is not the intention to have so many bodies. As soon as the work is done that body is dissolved.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:—

“That after item (G) the following item shall be added:

“(H) Board of Appointments.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:—

“That Clause 16 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

“Clause 16 was added to the Bill.”

CLAUSE 17.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I may draw the attention of the Hon'ble Members to the list of amendments to clause 17. Though they come numerically later, they relate to Clause 17. Therefore, they may be borne in mind.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I beg to move:

“That in sub-clause (1) Class I (B) items (ii), (iii), (iv), (v) and (viii) shall be deleted.”

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, I beg to move:

“That in sub-clause (1) Class I (B), items (vii) and (viii) shall be deleted.”

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I beg to move:

“That under the heading “Class I-*Ex-Officio* Members” in item (D) the word “Constituent” shall be deleted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendments moved.

“That in sub-clause (1) Class I (B) items (ii), (iii), (iv), (v) and (viii) shall be deleted.”

“That in sub-clause (1) Class I (B), items (vii) and (viii) shall be deleted.”

“That under the heading “Class I-*Ex-Officio* Members” in item (D) the word “Constituent” shall be Deleted.”

All these amendments are open for discussion.

SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, by this amendment I wish the deletion of items (ii), (iii), (iv), (v) and (viii), the Secretary to the Government of Mysore, Finance Department, the Director of Industries and Commerce in Mysore, the Director of Medical Services in Mysore, The Mayor, Municipal Corporation of the City of Bangalore and the President, Mysore Chamber of Commerce, Bangalore, need not be made members of that body. This Clause 17 deals with the constitution of the Senate and various classes of Members of Senate are there. This particular amendment deals with Class I—*Ex-Officio* Members. While considering the constitution of the Senate, two important things will have to be taken into consideration; first is its size and the second thing is representation. The size should not be unwieldy. It then should be a sizeable court of the University. Dr. Radhakrishnan Committee's report has recommended that the total number of the Senate should not exceed 100.

MR. SPEAKER.—On this point there was detailed discussion in the course of the general discussion.

SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—My point is that the Senate should be sizeable and should not be unwieldy. The Senate as constituted according to the clause will be very unwieldy. All class of persons are represented there. The University is an academic field. It is a field of learning and research. Only such elements as will promote learning, research and academic field should be there. The representation as enumerated here will not be appropriate and will not suit the very purpose of the University. Coming to Section (B), why should the Secretary to Government, Finance Department be there? A representative of the Finance Department will be in the Finance Committee. Under clause 26, a finance committee will be constituted and on that Committee one officer of the Department of Finance will be there, nominated by the Chancellor. So a representative of the Finance Department will be there in the University. Similarly, The Director of Industries and Commerce the Director of Medical Services. At the time of the consideration of the Bill, the Hon'ble Minister said that the University would be perfectly an autonomous body and that Government would not interfere with the University. If we look at the constitution of the Senate, Government will have a sort of upper hand in the Senate. All these officers will be nominated members. Why should all these officers be there, I do not understand. These departments may be consulted. About the President, Kannada Sahitya Parishat I have no objection, because this University will have to take into consideration research in Kannada language, literature and culture. So a representative of the Kannada Parishat should be there. That is my opinion. The President, Mysore Chamber, of Commerce is proposed to be included. What business has he there in the University? All these institutions or departments may be consulted. Their advice can be sought and they will be willingly giving their advice. There is no necessity of including their representatives in the Senate. That is why I move this amendment and I request the Minister to accept the same.

† Sri G. V. GOWDA.—My amendment simply seeks to delete items (vii) and (viii); that is, the President, Kannada Sahitya Parishat and the President, Mysore Chamber of Commerce. We have got to remember that the proposed University confines itself only to the Bangalore urban district. I have no objection to the Mayor becoming a member because he has also got some interest in Bangalore City. But this Kannada Sahitya Parishat extends to the entire State. Such being the case, there is no reason why the President of this Parishat should be an *ex-officio* member. My friend Sri Sunthankar has argued that there is need to conduct research in Kannada, and Literature and therefore, there is need to have a representative of the Kannada Sahitya Parishat. We will be having in the Senate Kannada Professors who would do that business and if we allow the Kannada Sahitya Parishat representative to become an *ex-officio* member, then we will be creating complications. The other language Parishats—Telugu Parishat, Tamil Parishat and Urdu Parishat can claim representation on the Senate. In Bangalore other languages have more percentage than Kannada. The Parishats of other languages also will claim that they must be given equal representation in view of the fact that the University is confined to Bangalore urban district. If it is throughout the State, then the matter will be different. It is not desirable to give representation to the President, Kannada Sahitya Parishat and also to the President of Mysore Chamber of Commerce. Even in the Madras University Act, we do not find such a provision. Introducing of element of nomination in respect of these persons; would, I submit, create more complications and also would invite claims being made by similar institutions. The Rotary Club of Bangalore, the Lions Club and other associations also may claim representation. Therefore, I request the Government to have this matter deeply considered and see that it is brought uniformly in accordance with other enactments in vogue in the State of Mysore.

† Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—As it is, the Principals of Constituent Colleges are to be the members of the Senate. My amendment is to delete the word 'Constituent' in item (D) and as amended, it would read "The Principals of Colleges." The word 'College' is defined in Clause 2 as;

"College" means an institution maintained by the University as such and includes an institution admitted to the privileges of the University as a Constituent College of the University in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the Statutes and Ordinances."

As it is, the University institutions will not get any right. Only the Constituent Colleges will get the right. My object is to see that the Principals of the institutions maintained by the University also come in here. After all, the very essential thing is omitted—the University College. If there are more Colleges of the University, those Principals will not get a chance. There are University Colleges as well as Constituent Colleges. As it is, it will deprive the University Colleges of

(SRI GANJI VEERAPPA)

an opportunity to get themselves represented here. My amendment seeks to bring in Principals of the University Colleges also here so that they may become members of the Senate. It can be accepted without any controversy.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I support the amendments moved by my friends Sriyuths B. R. Sunthankar and Venktai Gowda. The Senate as constituted here has got about 8 members from the Departments of Government—Secretaries to Government. I cannot understand why the Secretary to Government, finance Department should find a place in the Senate, why the Director of Medical Services and the Director of Industries should be included here. These are all officers of Government that are included in the constitution of the Senate. They should have absolutely no place in an academic body like the Senate. The Senate is a body which should be constituted to comprise members from various academic bodies. Perhaps Government has thought it necessary to increase the strength by including Secretaries and Heads of Departments so that they can count upon their support. This would mean Government entering into the University academic bodies by the back door. Government Secretaries and Directors have no place in the Senate and it is absolutely a retrograde measure.

Regarding the amendment moved by Sri Ganji Veerappa, I am sorry I have to oppose it for the simple reason that the Principals of the Constituent Colleges have been specifically included because the Constituent Colleges will not be having any representation in the Senate.

The University colleges will be having their representatives in the shape of the Deans. The Deans are professors of University colleges because they are the centres of post-graduate studies. Every faculty in the University college will be represented by a Dean in the Senate. In addition to this, the Principals of colleges are not necessary.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, the present clause is very important from any point of view. The amendments suggested by Sri Sunthankar and Sri G. V. Gowda deserve to be given serious consideration. If the Government really intend to have the University as an autonomous body then they must accept the amendments. If they want to create a body which would carry out their behest, to implement the wishes of Ministers or the Members of the Treasury benches, then the provision of the Bill is good enough. But let not the Minister go about claiming from housetops that he is going to create an autonomous body. If he wants to create a body of henchmen who would obey his and his party's dictates, then by all means let him retain the present clause but let us be clear about the intentions.

The University is being created with a view to promote higher learning and research. It has nothing to do with politics. If we vitiate the atmosphere with politics, then it would go to the dogs and ultimately the nation would suffer. Let this body, the Senate, consist of persons who are concerned with learning, education and research in the various

fields and not of hirelings and servants of the Government. Government must cut off their connections with the University except by way of giving money required by the University. Then alone the University would thrive; otherwise all the money and energy would have been wasted in political squabbles and influences. I would request the Hon'ble Minister not to make this a point of prestige. Let him not think in terms of employing his own men, whatever be their worth, for these posts. The amendment would do away with the heterogeneous elements in the senate which will definitely create troubles of all sorts and hamper the work of honest men who want to do something in the field of education and research. We see today that our politicians are spoiling everything and I would only hope they would not enter the portals of education and convert it into a battleground of politics. Those in the treasury benches should not think that they are competent to do everything. They are not so omnipotent as to fill up any and every office. It is politics that is vitiating all honest endeavours in this country and let not this evil find its way into the lecture halls and research laboratories. Academic matters should be left to persons connected with education. I hope the Minister would consider the matter seriously and do the right thing.

† Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I have already said that I cannot accept the amendments except the one moved by Sri Ganji Veerappa. Sri Sunthakar argued that the senate should not be an unwieldy body and that it should not exceed 100 in membership. If he calculates, he will come to the conclusion that it would be less than 85.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What about the donors?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The donors would be only one or two. Let not the Hon. Member think that people will give Rs. 50,000 or one lakh just to become members of a senate. On the whole the entire body would not exceed 85. Out of that, I have calculated the number of nominations and those who are *ex-officio* members. Both put together, it may not exceed 18. It may be just 20. In a body of 80 or 85, if there are 20 who are nominated or *ex-officio* members, I do not think it can be argued that the entire body of the senate is going to be swayed or influenced by them.

I would ask the Hon. Members to refer to the statutes of the Delhi University. There the total membership comes to 200. Hon. Members forget that this is not an affiliating University but a Federal University. Everyone should feel that they are part and parcel of the University. It should be as broad as possible. It is a City University. It is not going to cost much by way of T.A. At the most the Members may get some sitting fees but the atmosphere would be conducive to creating the feeling that the University belongs to one and all. Section 15 of the Mysore University Act provides that the Director of Medical Services, the Director of Agriculture, the Director, of Industries and Commerce and the Secretary to Education Department, shall be members of the senate. We have added the Finance Secretary, for a good reason because he must know what is happening. He should have a soft corner towards the University. Sitting in Vidhāna Soudha, it is possible for the Secretary not to understand the problems of the University. Sir, in the Karnāṭaka

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

University six members designated by the State Government represent various departments like Technical Education, Agriculture, Public Health, Industries, Public Works and Forest. They go a step further and say 'the Heads of the University Departments are also included'. We have not included them here. Objection was taken to the inclusion of President, Kannada Sahitya Parishad. In the constitution of the Karnataka University Senate it is mentioned that two members of such literary associations of the University or representatives of writers and authors may be designated which means the Kannada Sahitya Parishad should have two. The Karnatak University have gone a step further and say, one member of the Co-operative Banks and one member of the Co-operative Societies. Sir, it was also argued that the Mayor of the Bangalore City Corporation should be a member. The Mayor is the first citizen of Bangalore City and therefore, he must get a seat in the Senate. There, two members from the Chamber of Commerce get seats, and here we have one representative from the Mysore Chamber of Commerce. I think, what we have done is very modest and we ought to have been a little more liberal and included many more persons that we have done.

4-30 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That in clause 17 sub-clause 1, class I (B) items (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) and (viii) shall be deleted."

The amendment was negitived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That in sub-clause (1) Class I (B), items (vii) and (viii) shall be deleted."

The amendment was negitived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That under the heading "Class I Ex-Office Members" in item (d) the word "Constituent" shall be deleted."

The amendment was adopted.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, I beg to move:

"That under the heading 'Class II-Elected Members' in item (i) for the word 'Four' the word 'Six' shall be substituted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That under the heading 'Class II-Elected Members' in item (i) for the word 'Four' the word 'Six' shall be substituted."

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move:

“That under the heading “Class II-Elected Members” in item (ii) for the word “Two” the word “Three” shall be substituted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That under the heading “Class II-Elected Members” in item (ii) for the word “Two” the word “Three” shall be substituted.”

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I accept Six for the Assembly and Three for the Council.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, I oppose Sri Ganji Veerappa's amendment. If we consider the strength of the Council, they deserve only two seats and this House deserves Six. Therefore, I oppose his amendment.

† Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Sir, the Bill provides for the representation of four Members from the Assembly and two from the Council. The number was inadequate and I thought by an amendment that number could be increased to Six and Three respectively. When we have increased the number in this House it is not fair not to increase in the other House. Let the elders have the benefit of sending three members.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That under the heading “Class II-Elected Members” in item (i) for the word “Four” the word “Six” shall be substituted.”

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That under the heading “Class II-Elected Members” in item (ii) for the word “Two” the word “Three” shall be substituted.”

The amendment was adopted.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, I beg to move:

“That under the Heading “Class III-Nominated Members” item A shall be deleted.”

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, I beg to move:

“That under the Heading “Class III-Nominated Members” for items A and B the following shall be substituted:—

“Five members nominated by the Chancellor as specified below:

- (i) Two members who shall be Head Masters of High Schools or Higher Secondary Schools within the University area;
- (ii) Three members who shall be persons interested in higher education, and representatives of special interest.”

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, I beg to move:—
 “That under the heading ‘Class III-Nominated Members’ in item (B) for the words ‘Five members’ the words ‘Three members’ shall be substituted.”

Sri N. HUCHMASTHY GOWDA.—Sir, I do not want to move my amendments.

MR. SPEAKER.—Amendments moved.

“That under the heading ‘Class III-Nominated Members’ in item A shall be deleted.”

“That under the heading ‘Class III-Nominated Members’ for items A and B the following shall be substituted:—

“Five members nominated by the Chancellor as specified below:

(i) Two members who shall be Head Masters of High Schools or Higher Secondary Schools within the University area;

(ii) Three members who shall be persons interested in higher education, and representatives of special interest.”

“That under the heading ‘Class III-Nominated members’ in item (B) for the words ‘Five members’ the words ‘Three members’ shall be substituted.”

All the above amendments are open for discussion.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—As regards Class III, I have moved two amendments. One is that the nomination by the Government should be altogether done away with and that there should be no nomination by the Government. In every class, the Government has got its representatives there. Why Government should have special nomination, I do not understand. The second point is that the Chancellor will nominate five persons. My amendment proposes three and the members should be appointed by the Chancellor for special interests of linguistic minorities and such other interests. The representatives of special interests should be there and three members would be sufficient. My intention is to reduce the number of nominated members to a minimum. The Chancellor should not nominate more than three persons.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—When the Government would not interfere with the constitution or administration of the University, I do not understand why the Government should take the responsibility of nominating persons to the Senate. Even if there is an element of nomination, let the Chancellor be empowered to make the nomination. Clause (a) says:

“Three persons nominated by the Government.....”

This is not found even in the Karnatak University Act or the Madras University Act or the Mysore University Act. This is a new thing added here, which is undesirable. Government should not enter this arena of the Senate much less it should interfere in the day-to-day administration of the University. Therefore, I suggest that the nomination be

made by the Chencellor himself, two from High Schools, or Higher Secondary Schools within the University area and the other three shall be persons interested in higher education and representatives of special interests. I have copied this from the other statutes, and therefore, if the Hon'ble Minister were to agree to my amendment, that would be in consonance with the other enactments.

† Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I cannot accept the amendments. There are provisions for nominations everywhere. I can show that there is provision for ten nominations in the Karnatak University area, and even under the Mysore University Act, nine Members are nominated by the Chancellor. It means the same thing and I agree that it has been split into two, the Chancellor or Government. Of course, Government feels that the Industry should have representation and also the Head Masters of High Schools or Higher Secondary Schools.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:—
“That under the Heading ‘Class III-Nominated Members’ item A shall be deleted.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:—
That under the Heading ‘Class III-Nominated Members’ for items A and B the following shall be substituted:

“Five members nominated by the Chancellor as specified below:

- (i) Two members who shall be Head Masters of High Schools or Higher Secondary Schools within the University area;
- (ii) Three members who shall be persons interested in higher education, and representatives of special interest.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:—
“That under the heading ‘Class III-Nominated Members’ in item B for the words ‘Five members’ the words ‘three members’ shall be substituted.”

The amendment was negatived.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, I beg to move—
“That ‘Class IV-Donor Members’ shall be deleted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved—
“That ‘Class IV-Donor Members’ shall be deleted.”

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move :

—“That after sub-clause (2) the following sub-clause shall be added :—

“(3) The Donor Members shall not have the right to vote in the election of the Vice-Chancellor.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That after sub-clause (2) the following sub-clause shall be added :—

“(3) The Donor Members shall not have the right to vote in the election of the Vice-Chancellor.”

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—It does not survive.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Why ?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Because the Senate has no right at all. We have already accepted the procedure in respect of the Vice-Chancellor. The Syndicate will nominate two and the Chancellor will nominate one. This body will recommend a panel of three. So, this question does not arise here.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, I have moved this amendment expecting that the Vice-Chancellor would be an elected Vice-Chancellor. I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

The Amendment was by leave of the House withdrawn.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—My object in moving this amendment is that the Donor should not be represented on the Senate. Just because they give some charity to the University, that does not mean that they must be represented on the University, and that they must get a representation on the Senate. Under Class IV-Donor Member item (1) says :

“Donors to the University of not less than one lakh of rupees shall be life members.....”

Donors will be life members and they will be there life-long on the Senate. I do not understand the necessity of having these Donors on the Senate.

Mr. SPEAKER.—To attract donations.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—It does not mean that donation should be rewarded in this manner. If donors are given representation, there is the likelihood of many donors governing the University. Again, if we give representation to the donors, the number will be very large. In case we get a large number of donors, the Senate will be very unweildy. So I request Government to accept my amendment.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ನನ್ನೆಯದಿವನ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಸೆನೇಟ್ ಒಂದು ಫಿಷ್ ಮಾರ್ಕಟ್ ಆಗಿವಾರದೊಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಈ ಮನೋದಯಲ್ಲಿರುವಂತೆ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ಐವತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರ ಹಣ ಕೊಡುವವರಲ್ಲಿ ಸೆನೇಟಿಗೆ ನದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಂಥವರನ್ನು ಸೆನೇಟಿಗೆ

ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಆನಂದಿ ದಿಗ್ಗಿ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು: ಹೀಗೆ ದಿಗ್ಗಿ ಕೊಡಲು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ದಾನ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರಿಗೆ ಮಹಾರಾಜರು ಧರ್ಮ ರತ್ನಾಕರ ಎಂಬ ಬಿರುದನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇಂಥವರಿಗೆ ಸೂರ್ಯಪ್ರಕಾಶ ಎಂಬ ಬಿರುದನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಿ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಮಹಾರಾಜರು ಒಂದು ಚಿನ್ನದ ಪದಕ ಮತ್ತು ಶಾಲನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹಾರ ಹಾಕಿಸಿ ಕಳಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಜನರು ತಿರುಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಹಾಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾನಾಪೊಕೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಇವರಿಗೆ ದಿಗ್ಗಿ ಕೊಡಿ. ಯಾರಾದರೂ ವಿ ಐ ಪಿ ಗಳು ಬಂದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ನಾನವಿರಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ, ಹಾಗೆಯೇ, ಐದತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರ, ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರಿಗೆ ಅವರು ಜೀವಂತರಾಗಿರುವವರೆಗೆ ಯೂನಿ ವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕಾನಾಪೊಕೇಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇಂತಹ ಸ್ನಾನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಎಲ್ಲೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ಬಿರು ದಾನ ಕೊಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ತಕ್ಷಣವೇ ನಾವೂ ಸೆನೇಟ್ ಮೆಂಬರಾಗುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಕಾಳಸಂತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣೆ ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡುವವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ದಾನ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 85 ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು 350 ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗ ಸೆನೇಟ್ ಮೀಟಿಂಗ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಭಾಂಗಣವನ್ನೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನಾನವನ್ನು ಪಲ್ಲಟ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಸಭಾಂಗಣ ವನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅವರನ್ನು ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅವರ ಬಸ್ಸು ಎಂದರೆ ಪ್ರತಿಮೆಯನ್ನು ಅಮೃತಶಿಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ, ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾ ನಿಲಯದ ಮುಂದಿಡಬಹುದು. ಅಥವಾ ಕಂಚಿನ ವಿಗ್ರಹ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಇಡಬಹುದು. ನಮ್ಮ ಕಬ್ಬಿನ್ ಪಾರ್ಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲೋರಿಯ ರಾಣಿ, ಎಡ್‌ವರ್ಡ್ ಮುಂತಾದವರ ಪ್ರತಿಮೆಗಳನ್ನು ಟ್ಟಿರುವಂತೆ ಇಡ ಬಹುದು. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಲಿ ಎಂದು ಮತ್ತೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ, ಡೋನಾರ್ ಮೆಂಬರ್ ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕು. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಕಾರ್‌ಜನ್ನು ಖಾಸಗಿಯವರು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮತಿಗಾಗಿ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇಂತಹ ಹದಿನೈದು ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತು ಜನಗಳ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮುಂದೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಇಂತಹ ಜನರು ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಸೆನೇಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್‌ಗೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಡೋನಾರ್ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಬರಲು ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಡೋನಾರ್ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಒಟ್ಟು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷದ ಜನರಿಂದಲೇ ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್ ತುಂಬಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಜಾಗವೇ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒನ್‌ವೇ, ಟ್ರಾಫಿಕ್, ತೆರ ಹಜಾರ್ ಬಾರಾ ಹಜಾರ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದೇ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಾದರೆ ಫೆಡರಲ್ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಸೆನೇಟ್ ಅನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಪದವನ್ನು ಸೃಷ್ಟಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸುಂಠಣಕರ್ ಅವರು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಣಕಾಸಿನಿಂದ ಜನರ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿರ ಬಾರದೆಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಅವರು ಆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಡೋನರುಗಳು ಸೆನೇಟ್‌ಗೆ ಬರಲೇಬಾರದು.

5-00 P.M.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಗಂಗಾಧರ ನಾಮೋಶಿ (ಗುಲಬರ್ಗ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಡೋನರ್‌ರನ್ನು ಸೆನೇಟ್ ಸದಸ್ಯ ರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಮಾಜವಾದಿ ಸಮಾಜ ರಚನೆಯ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಡಸ್ಟ್ರೀಸ್ ರಿಪ್ರೆಸೆಂಟೇಟಿವ್ ಆದವರನ್ನು ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸಹ ಸರಿಯಾಗ ರಾರದು. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇಂಡಸ್ಟ್ರೀಜ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕ್ಯಾಪಿಟಾಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಚೇಂಬರ್ ಆಫ್ ಕಾಮರ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಬಂಡವಾಳದಾರರೇ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಬಂಡವಾಳದಾರರನ್ನು ಸೆನೇಟ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನಾಗಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಸಮಾಜವಾದ ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪದವೀವು ಉಪ ಯೋಗ್ಯ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸುಂಠಣಕರ್ ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಸೋಷಾ ಲಿಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ವ್ಯಾಜರ್ನ್ ಆಫ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ನಮ್ಮ ಧ್ಯೇಯವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಮೇಲೆ ಡೋನರ್‌ರನ್ನು ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಬಂಡವಾಳದಾರರು ಸೇರಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಹಿಡಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕೆಲವು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಕೂಲು ಇಂಡಸ್ಟ್ರೀಜ್ ಮುಂತಾದ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂಡವಾಳದಾರರು ಸೇರಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗು ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಹ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಡೋನರ್‌ರ ಆದವರು ಬಂಡವಾಳಗಾರರೇ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಂಥವರು ಕರೆತು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಗಂಗಾಧರ ನಾಮೋಶಿ).

ನೀಟ್ ಮಾರಾಟ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಲೆಕ್ಕರಸ್ತೆ ಫೋನ್ಮುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾರಾಟ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ್ಗೆ ದುಡ್ಡು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಇದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಈಗ ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಮಂಡಿಸಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—With regard to the donor members, I have a word to say. Very uncharitable remarks and very imaginary fears and objections have been raised. Our experience in the Mysore University shows that for endowments worth 2 or 3 thousands, for the last 10 years it has not increased by 5 or 10. For becoming a Member of the Senate, which meets twice a year, I do not think there would be many who will rush in great haste with a lakh of rupees each to capture the market. Such an argument is baseless. Let us not be uncharitable to those who make liberal donations with large heartedness. There is no power to capture here. I might incidentally suggest that the powers of nomination here, might best be vested with the Chancellor instead of the Government.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, I support the amendment. The Education Minister has made it a point to incorporate in this Bill such portions of the Delhi University Act which are convenient to him in total disregard of those portions which are inconvenient. This is a peculiar characteristic of our Education Minister. I strongly and unequivocally oppose the provision for making donors members of the senate. The syndicate has been given abundant powers. The senate selects 3 members to the syndicate and as very well pointed out by Sri Muckannappa this provision of making a donor a member of the senate and providing a vote for him will ultimately mean that the moneybags would play a role in the elections. I am afraid, Sri Ganji Veerappa has, in supporting the Minister, spoiled the case. He referred to the Mysore University where, he said philanthropists have not been coming forward. But there is no provision in the Mysore University Act for a donor becoming a member of the senate. A philanthropist gives donation voluntarily without expecting any reward in return. By providing this attraction of making the donor a member of the senate, we are putting a price for membership. In that case, may I ask why we should not put a price for becoming a Member of the Assembly also? This kind of practice is quite meaningless. There is no provision for representation of labour, though such a thing is provided under the Delhi Act. But there is abundant provision for the Chamber of Commerce, industrialists and money barons. Our proclamation of socialism should not be reduced to such a mockery. The senate should not consist solely of rich men, who can buy membership for a sum of money. If that is allowed so much of filth will enter into the portals of the University and vitiate its atmosphere. I know what the Minister has in his mind. He has something bad in his mind. I am greatly concerned about this University. I want this University to be such as anyone would be proud of it but its various organs should not consist of filthy lucre which money can purchase. If the Education

Minister is adamant and feels 'he can win' the day, with his brute majority, let him have his day but that 'would not improve the University.' It is our duty to ventilate our grievances whether he likes it or not. I want that the purity of the educational system should be maintained. I request the Education Minister to rise to the occasion, to show some reason, and accept this amendment so that rich persons may not become full-fledge members of the senate.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವೆಂಕಟೇಶ್ವರ (ನಾಗಮಂಗಲ).—ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್, ಬಲಗೈ ದಾನ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಎದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಣಿಕೊಡದು ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ನಾಣ್ಯದಿ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. ಡೋನರ್ ಆದವರಿಗೆ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ಆತೆ ತೋರಿಸಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ಸೆನೆಟ್ ನಡವಳಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರೊಪೊಸಿಷನ್ ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅಗತ್ಯ. ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಡೋನರ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಸೀಟುಗಳಿಗೆ ಎರೆಕ್ಷನ್ ನಡೆಯುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಈ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

†Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I oppose the amendment. Such a provision is made even in the Karnataka University Act. After all, how many people would come forward with such donations? On the other hand, if the opposition members are of the opinion that there should be made any donations in regard to this University, then that is a different matter. Those who give money must be respected and given a seat in the Senate. After all, in a body of 80 or 85 members what does it matter if give one or two seats?

My friend put forth another argument that there has no representation for the labour. If he reads that the five nominations to be made by the Chancellor will be not only for the interest of higher education but also representation for special interest, the labour can come in there. Sri Sivappa, the Opposition Leader is thinking that he is a better socialist than myself. If he wants to credit himself with it, that is all right. But, I may tell him that I do not possess even one-tenth of the property that he possesses.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Sri Sivappa must share all that with the Education Minister. (loud laughter)

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I am as much a socialist if not better, as my friend Sri Sivappa is, I do not yield on that point. Members are very critical about the Government nominating three members. If they say Government should not nominate but the Chancellor should; I quite agree. We may delete the words "by the Government" and substitute the words "by the Governor". The clause as such has not been accepted and so instead of three members nominated by the Government, we may say, three members nominated by the Governor.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—May I know whether the Minister will agree to put a limit to the donor clause to be only five and not more than five?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, my friend does not know that we will not get even five. In the Karnataka University, there is none.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What was that agreement that was spoken of about class III? It has been once rejected.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, how can the chair go back?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I am not insisting. Because such an amendment might come up in the upper House and then we will have to come again before this House, which means delay, I made the suggestion. If the rules permit, it may be done.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If there are any rules, the Hon. Minister may kindly point out to me.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, what has been rejected by the House is (A). They wanted entire (A) to be dropped, and that has been rejected.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Anyway, I will have the position examined. The Secretary will examine it in the meanwhile.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I want to make it still clear. I am sorry I am disturbing the Hon. Chair. I want Hon. Members to read amendment No. 36.

“Under the heading “Class III Nominated Members” item A shall be deleted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—What the Hon. Minister means is, that the whole unit as such has been rejected; and that a portion of it can be changed by way of a fresh amendment. Anyhow, the position will be examined. I will put the amendment of Sri Sunthankar to vote.

The question is.

“That class IV Donor Members” shall be deleted”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, coming back, I think there should be some amendment.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, amendment to the amendment should have been moved at the time of accepting or rejecting it. At no time in the history of the Mysore Legislature, an amendment which had been put vote rejected, has been reopened.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have put the amendment to the vote of House and not the clause.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, one amendment was for deletion of A, the second one was for substitution of A and B and the third was for substitution of B.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is his proposed amendment?

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—My amendment is that in class III for the word, ‘Government’ there word ‘Chancellor’ be substituted. It is very appropriate that the Chancellor should nominate and not, the Government. I do not think any of us would disagree.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He can give it in writing.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—It is with me, Sir.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I think it is a new procedure that the chair wants to allow in this case. I cannot understand how an amendment to amendment is allowed after the main amendment is

rejected. Sir, till now, the chair has been guiding us on correct lines (laughter)

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—There is no need for parts (A) and (B). So, the entire clause has got to be changed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the position? Should these nominations be made by the Government or the Chancellor? Which is better?

Sri. G. V. GOWDA.—We pleaded for the Chancellor; but that was opposed. If it is acceptable, there is no need for parts (A) and (B) because the entire body will be nominated by the Chancellor.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What did we do? We took up the amendment No. 36 and then it is a lengthy amendment which says:

“Five members nominated by the Chancellor as specified below.

(i) Two members who shall be Head Master of High Schools or Higher Secondary Schools within the University area;

(ii) Three members who shall be persons interested in higher education, and representatives of special interest.”

That entire unit was rejected. Now, the paper before me, if it is acceptable under the rules, does not convey the idea contained there. Keeping the whole sub-clause as such, the suggestion is to delete the word ‘Government’ and substitute the word ‘Chancellor’. These three amendments are not in conflict with one another. An amendment which has once been dealt with cannot be reproduced. It is not an amendment which has been rejected. It is only to delete the word ‘Government’ and substitute the word ‘Chancellor’ Keeping the entire clauses (A) and (B) as such.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Then there is no need for (A) and (B).

Mr. SPEAKER.—But, is there any bar to entertain it? If there is no bar, it is perfectly usual to allow it. But, it is for the House to decide. I cannot say ‘I accept it’. Amendments from the Government even at late stages have been allowed.

I will allow for discussion of this amendment. I believe, I have already given a Ruling that amendments moved by the Government stand on a different footing for the reason that the whole Bill is sponsored by them.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The previous ruling has given by the chair on a different footing, because the Government, at an appropriate time moved the amendment. Now, the circumstances are different.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Whether it is appropriate or not, the test is whether the Clause has been passed by the House? If it has been passed, I have no right. This has not been passed. Amendments have been rejected, but the Clause has not been put to the vote of the House. Therefore, there is no bar to this amendment being entertained. If, on the other hand, members say that there is a bar, and that Government is therefore

2531 (MR. SPEAKER) gaining need and wish edit nor lit it. (1949)

not entitled to move it then the chair cannot help. The general argument was that instead of the Government the Chancellor should have that right.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Please see the intention of the Amendments Nos. 36 and 37.

(B) Mr. SPEAKER.—That is exactly what is being done now. Sri G. V. GOWDA.—That is rejected. The intention is that no nomination.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the member want all these things to go into the proceedings? If he wants, I have no objection.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—My submission is that when once the intention of empowering the Chancellor to make nominations is rejected, could it be re-opened? Amendments Nos. 36 and 37 mainly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member may kindly omit the word 'mainly' and mention the particular procedure, that is three plus two or whatever it is.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—That is a different matter. Here items (A) and (B) says, Three persons nominated by the Government, Five persons nominated by the Chancellor.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How will the Hon. members amendment No. 36 cover it?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Under item (B) five members are nominated by the Chancellor. Here the intention to have the Chancellor to nominate is clear.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let us not mix up the idea.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Her it is five it is small.

Mr. SPEAKER.—However small, it may be that makes all the difference. What has been rejected by the House is Amendment No. 37. The idea of amendment No. 37 is three fold, one is with regard to nomination, the other is with regard to the nomination by the Chancellor and the third is in respect of the number.

What are the components? The components are not the same as are found here.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—The first component, namely nomination by the Chancellor, is the same.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The rejection might have been on account of the other components. Therefore legally there is no bar.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—If we entertain the amendment as proposed, the clause will look very bad. This House will take the blame for that, because it is responsible for enacting the law. In my opinion, when it has been rejected in its entirety involving two portions, one portion cannot be entertained.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—How does the Speaker go back in permitting an amendment to an amendment which has already been rejected by the House? The entire clause is not to be voted. The amendment has been put to vote and lost. Now just to console the Opposition, the Government comes forward with an amendment to the amendment which has been rejected.

MR. SPEAKER.—The further point that has been raised by Sri Muckannappa is that an amendment to an amendment which has been rejected can not be permitted. If the amendment is rejected it is dead and gone; it is *functus officio*; it is inoperative. Therefore, if what he says is correct, an amendment to an amendment which has been rejected cannot be sustained, because there must be an amendment and the amendment must be to an amendment which is subsisting before the House. To that extent he is right. But he goes further and says that this is an amendment to an amendment. This is an amendment to the main clause. Is this to be rejected because the previous amendment is rejected? I am saying that the passing or rejecting of amendment No. 37 does not control the life of this amendment.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—After the train has left the Station, my friend Sri Ganji Veerappa has purchased the ticket to catch the train. This is how that thing has happened. Because we have discussed class III and the matter was put to the vote of the House and the House rejected the amendment. It is after that my friend is going in a Buick car to catch the train in Yeswantpur, just to travel further.

SRI GANJI VEERAPPA.—The train is still here.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—We have already discussed class III and expressed our views.

MR. SPEAKER.—Who has expressed?

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The House. The amendment whether the power should be with the Vice-Chancellor or with the Government was discussed and rejected.

MR. SPEAKER.—The clause has not been discussed. The amendment has been discussed.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Before discussing this amendment now moved by Sri Ganji Veerappa, why should we go to amendment No. 39? After discussing amendments Nos. 33 and 39, we went further. It is a very strange procedure that we are coming across. The Chair has given a ruling that Government can move an amendment in appropriate time just to make the law perfect. In this case it is a new thing. In the last 73 years I have not come across such a procedure at any time. I would, therefore, request the Speaker that before he takes a decision, sufficient thought is bestowed on it. Because it is a procedural matter which will guide the Legislature in coming years.

MR. SPEAKER.—I have taken so much time for the purpose of convincing the members.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Speaker allowed the House some time to discuss even trivial matters. When we are at class IV, my friend is now moving an amendment to Class III. Government cannot bring an amendment now through my friend Sri Ganji Veerappa. Let it go to the Legislative Council; let them move an amendment there; let the Bill come back. They want to have time and bring the enactment at once. Let them go in the right royal way. Even the Chair cannot exercise its jurisdiction under the Rules of Procedure.

Even the Speaker has no right to allow the amendment at this stage. There is no such precedent or convention in this House. I request the chair to think over the matter before he decides to entertain this amendment at this late stage. Our procedure does not allow the grant of such permission. I suggest that this might be taken up tomorrow so that we can also study the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Shall we hold over this clause and proceed to the rest of the Bill?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I request the Chair to adjourn the proceedings now so that we might have some time to think about it. It is already 5.45 P. M. now.

Mr. SPEAKER.—At the request of hon. Members we are meeting from 12.30 P.M. daily again at his request, we had recess for half-an-hour today. If I go on conceding in this manner, we may not be able to finish the business.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—The amendment has two portions which have been rejected in its entirety.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is there anything like a portion of an amendment? If an amendment had been disposed of, it cannot be taken up again. Suppose the hon. Member had given two amendments separately; one being exactly the same as given by him and the other which is being debated upon. I would have admitted both. If the wordings of the amendments are slightly different, then they should be treated as separate amendments and voted separately.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Government rejected my amendment substituting the word "Chancellor" for Government. The House cannot accept the same amendment moved by somebody else.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not what has happened. What is rejected is a unit of something bigger. The bigger thing might still be accepted by the House. There is nothing like a portion of an amendment being accepted or not. We should take note of the identity of the amendment as a whole and not a few parts or words here and there.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—The Government could have accepted my proposal for appointment by chancellor and rejected that portion about the numerical strength. It consisted of two parts; one could have been accepted and the other rejected.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That cannot be done. It should be moved separately. Government cannot accept a portion of the amendment unless the amendment itself is split and put separately to the vote of the House.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Several instances have taken place in this House itself where portions of amendments have been accepted by Government. To clause 4 itself I moved an amendment and the Education Minister said that I had not included two words. I readily agreed and moved the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That was incorporated and the amendment as amended was put to vote. How can this amendment be split and put to vote as for that clause? I have put the whole clause to the vote of the House. All amendments have been accepted or rejected. I put the clause as amended to the vote of the House. The hon'ble Member is mixing up reasons and ideas.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I wanted that nomination should be made by the Chancellor and not by the Government. That has been rejected.

Sri R. M. PATIL (Minister for Home)—Sir, I wish to draw the attention of my Hon'ble friend to amendments Nos. 31 to 39. They referred to sub-clause (1) Clause 17. All of them are disposed of either by accepting or by rejecting. Then remains the main clause *i.e.*, sub-clause (1) to Clause 17 to be considered. Before that, another amendment is pushed in and that amendment is for consideration now. This is a new amendment to the main clause for a different purpose. If that amendment is to be considered as an amendment to the amendment, then, it has no place because all the amendments are disposed of. This is the main amendment to the main clause, *i.e.*, sub-clause (1) of Clause 17. Therefore, it is not inconsistent nor is it out of order. It is perfectly in order and it may be taken into consideration.

So far as amendment No. 37 is concerned, it says:

“Five members nominated by the Chancellor as specified below”.

This has been rejected. It has been rejected by the House in respect of the entire amendment as such, *i.e.*, Five members and also ‘by the Chancellor’. The substance of it is entirely rejected. Now, a new amendment is to be considered in a different way. While the same authority remains, the number of nominations differ. The sum and substance of the amendment is: instead of five, should be three and instead of Government—the Chancellor should nominate. So, it is a different amendment to the main clause.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, we shall adjourn now. This is a procedural matter and I request the Hon'ble Speaker to go through various procedures. To my mind, it is perfectly clear that it is not provided for in the Rules of Procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let me clarify the position; there are only five minutes now.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, let me say a word. So far as the amendment given just now is concerned, sufficient arguments have been advanced. The Hon'ble Speaker may just say whether he accepts it or rejects it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—My decision now will not take us further because there are only five minutes to Six.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I can say in one word that the clause has not been voted. The Chair has made it abundently clear that this is not an amendment to the amendment. What is rejected is the amendment. This is an amendment to the main clause and it is simple and it is perfectly clear. If the Hon'ble Members want to argue in the same manner, they can do it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We have also to take them with us.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—If they appreciate the Chair's stand, it is all right; otherwise, it would be impossible for the Chair to take a decision.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to know by what time we may finish this business will it be by 3 O'clock tomorrow?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, we shall see how it goes on.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House now stands adjourned to meet tomorrow at 12-30 p.m.

The House adjourned at Six of the Clock to meet again at Thirty Minutes past Twelve of the Clock on Friday, the 19th June 1964.
